

TALS-Allotments Policy Issues

Issue #1

Should there be one required level of detail for expenditure allotment data or should agencies continue to have options?

Current Policy

OFM requires all agencies to submit monthly expenditure allotments for each program by object and by expenditure authority code. Agencies may choose Option 1 (provide monthly object level detail separate from monthly amounts by account and expenditure authority) or Option 2 (provide monthly object level detail by account and expenditure authority).

Agencies may change options between biennia, but must retain the same option throughout a biennium. OFM sees all data at the Option 1 level regardless of the option selected by an agency.

Options

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Description	Require all agencies to provide object detail by month separate from allotments by account and expenditure authority code. (Require all agencies to use Option 1)	Require all agencies to provide monthly object detail by account and expenditure authority. (Require all agencies to use Option 2)	Retain current policy of giving agencies a choice on the level of detail
Benefits		<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Provides object information for each specific appropriation. This information may be useful for some OFM analyses and is beneficial to many agencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Provides flexibility to agencies.
Risks or Consequences	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Does not provide agencies with the detail that some require.- May have costs for agencies related to adjustments needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- May require more allotment preparation effort for agencies now using Option 1, depending on system design.- May have costs for agencies related to	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Higher system development and maintenance costs to build a system with options

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	for internal systems	adjustments needed for internal systems - May increase AFRS transactions costs if current pricing approach remains in place.	
Implementation issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to understand the impact on agency internal systems - One option may eliminate some design, construction, and testing time for the new system, as well as reducing training related and maintenance costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create system tools that minimize data entry - Need to understand the impact on agency internal systems - One option may eliminate some design, construction, and testing time for the new system, as well as reducing training related and maintenance costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider giving OFM the ability of viewing data at the agency submitted level.
Critical success factors		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Option would need to be cost and workload neutral for agencies. 	

Proposed Approach

Alternative 2: Require object detail by account-EA type, appropriation or expenditure authority, and month, if there is a system design benefit and if TALS can supply labor-saving tools for agencies. Otherwise consider Alternative 3.

Concerns/Comments from Stakeholders

1. Per Art Overman, there are approximately 45 agencies that use Option 1 and 75 agencies that use Option 2. The notable agencies that use the less detailed Option 1 are the universities, large transportation agencies, and large natural resources agencies. These agencies have many accounts and consequently, the amount of data would increase considerable if we require Option 2 for all agencies. Art indicated that increase data entry and increased AFRS transactions costs would be the two concerns for these agencies. A review of AFRS pricing options is now in progress, and will consider issues like these.

